REMARKS

This Amendment is filed in response to the Final Office Action dated February 5, 2004, which has a shortened statutory period set to expire May 5, 2004.

Claims 1-19 Are Patentable Over The Cited References

Claim 1, as amended, now recites in part:

> selecting a state associated with the user profile using the first computer, the state comprising a plurality of cookies retrieved from other computers ...
>
> automatically providing a subset of the plurality of cookies to the application using the first computer, wherein the automatically providing is responsive to receiving a request over the telephone interface to initiate an application, and wherein the automatically providing comprises initiating the application on the first computer by interacting with the application using an IETF-compliant HTTP request to a second computer and including in the HTTP request at least one "Cookie:" header corresponding to at least one cookie in the subset of the plurality of cookie.

Claim 11, as amended, now recites in part:

> means for selecting a state associated with the user profile, the state comprising a plurality of cookies retrieved from other computers ...
>
> means for automatically providing a subset of the plurality of cookies to an application, wherein the means for automatically providing is responsive to receiving a request over the telephone interface to initiate an application, and wherein the means for automatically providing comprises means for initiating the application on the first computer by interacting with the application using an IETF-compliant HTTP request

to a second computer, the HTTP request including at least one "Cookie:" header corresponding to at least one cookie in the subset of the plurality of cookies.

Claim 14, as amended, now recites in part:

an Internet interface including at least one program to access a second computer system, the second computer system including an application; ...

a control subsystem to control the Internet interface and the telephone interface, the control subsystem including at least one program for identifying a user profile according to the telephone identifying information, the user profile having a corresponding state, the state comprising a plurality of cookies retrieved from other computer systems, the control subsystem initiating the application on the first computer by interacting with the application using an IETF-compliant HTTP request to the second computer system, the HTTP request including at least one "Cookie:" header corresponding to at least one cookie in the subset of the plurality of cookies.

Claim 15, as amended, now recites in part:

a third set of instructions for selecting a state associated with the user profile, the state comprising a plurality of cookies retrieved from other computers ...

a fourth set of instructions for automatically providing a subset of the plurality of cookies to an application, the fourth set of instructions responding to receiving a request over the telephone interface to initiate an application and initiating the application on the first computer by interacting with the application using an IETF-compliant HTTP request to a second computer, the HTTP request including at least one "Cookie:" header corresponding to at least one cookie in the subset of the plurality of cookie.

In amending the above claims, Applicants have clarified certain aspects of the recited method/apparatus/computer system/ computer program.

Summary Of The Invention

Applicants' invention works on any phone and is applicable to any web site using existing web cookies. For example, referring to Fig. 1, a user can call a voice portal 110 (i.e. the first computer) using telephone 100 or cellular telephone 101. Voice portal 110 can use the telephone identifying information corresponding to the telephone (e.g. the ANI) to identify the profile for that user. Voice portal 110 can also select a state associated with that user's profile. Advantageously, the state comprises existing web cookies retrieved from other computers (e.g. web server 108).

In this manner, for example, a user could use her cell phone to call the voice portal to order a book from Amazon.com. Later, when the user logs onto her computer, she could access the web site of Amazon.com and check on the shipping of the book she ordered using the cell phone. In another example, a user could access the web site of Amazon.com and order a book. When the user calls the voice portal to access Amazon.com, the voice portal could query whether she would like to check on when her ordered book will arrive or perhaps query whether she would like to order another book similar to the one previously ordered.

In either example, cookies retrieved from Amazon.com as well as other web sites and stored by the voice portal as associated with a user's profile allow the user to transact business or gather information over the telephone in an efficient, convenient, and secure manner. Specifically, a subset of the stored cookies can be selectively provided to the appropriate web sites when the user requests access. For

example, if the user wishes to transact with Amazon.com, the voice portal can ensure that cookies from other web sites, such as barnesandnoble.com, are not sent. Thus, Applicants' recited method, apparatus, computer system, and computer program provide significant advantages in seamlessly integrating and maintaining the confidentiality of user information gathered using a standard telephone and the Internet. Notably, this integration and maintenance can be accomplished without requiring the user to have special hardware or software.

Applicants' Claims Distinguish From The Cited References

Applicants respectfully submit that IETF RFC 2109, Bennett, and Krane fail to teach the recited limitations in Claims 1, 11, 14, and 15 and their associated advantages.

IETF RFC 2109 teaches a system in which a proxy server has state information about its relationship with the client that it wants the client to remember and to return with each request. Exemplary state information can include identity or preference information. Page 1, 2. Introduction. IEFT FRC 2109 further teaches that a CommentURL attribute allows a proxy server to document how it intends to user a PCookie (i.e. state information). The user can inspect the information identified by the URL to decide whether to initiate or continue a session with this PCookie. Page 4, 5.2 Proxy Server Role.

Therefore, contrary to the initial characterization in the Office Action, IETF RFC 2109 fails to disclose or suggest any use of telephone identifying information or even of a telephone interface. The Office Action acknowledges that IETF fails to teach the state being associated with a user's profile, the interface being a telephone interface, and identifying a user profile using the first computer and the telephone identifying

information. To remedy this deficiency, the Office Action further cites Bennett.

Bennett teaches that customer premises equipment (CPEs) 12,24 can communicate with the VOD modems 14,22, respectively, using a standard interface, such as an RS-232 interface, a personal computer parallel port, a PC bus, a universal serial bus, or the like. Col. 3, line 4-7. The VOD modems 14,22 permit voice and data from the CPEs 12,24 to be simultaneously transferred over the telephone network 15. The caller CPE 12 can be any terminal device adapted to store, transmit and receive "cookie" files, such as an intelligent telephone, a video phone, a computer, or the like. Col. 2, lines 62-64.

For completeness, Applicants also direct the Examiner's attention to Fig. 5 of Bennett. Fig. 5 illustrates a telecommunications system 80 in which a cookie server 86 permits the CPE 24 to store backup copies of the caller cookie files for later use by the service provider. Col. 5, lines 24-39.

Applicants note that Krane also fails to remedy the deficiencies of IETF RFC 2109 and Bennett. Specifically, Krane teaches a communication system for providing telephone access to pre-recorded audio messages via the Internet. Col. 2, lines 24-26. Specifically, once web access server 2 receives a valid access request (see, col. 3, lines 48-57), the Talk Web browser sends an http request to the web site server that contains the enhanced web audio server software, e.g. web site server 1 (see, col. 4, lines 57-67.

Therefore, even assuming arguendo that IETF, Bennett, and Krane can be combined (see below), Applicants' recited first computer, second computer, telephone interface, and their respective functions are not taught by these references.

The Combination Of The References Is Improper

Bennett teaches that a "cookie" file is essentially a computer-readable file containing information tokens, which can represent caller information (caller's name, home and/or business address, phone number, e-mail address, or the like), preferences, or the like. Col. 2, lines 28-30 and 37-39. Thus, the "cookie" file of Bennett is essentially a user profile. Applicants submit that the term "cookie" file is not used in the industry and, as described below, is not interchangeable with an IETF-compliant cookie.

As taught by the IETF RFC 2109, the term "Pcookie" (now shortened in the industry to "cookie") refers to the state information that passes between a proxy server and client, and that gets stored by the client. Page 2, Terminology. In other words, a cookie compliant with IETF RFC 2109 is a piece of text that a web server can store on a user's computer. The cookie is stored as name-value pairs. Pages 2-3, Syntax: General.

The Office Action states it would have been obvious to combine the teaching of IETF with the teaching of Bennett by utilizing cookies so that the service provider would not be required to store and maintain user's profiles, thus enhancing the system's efficiency. Applicants respectfully traverse this combination. Bennett fails to disclose or suggest using cookies instead of cookie files. Indeed, Bennett explicitly teaches that an advantage of cookie files is that service providers would not be required to store and maintain caller profiles. Col. 2, lines 47-49. Therefore, Bennett would logically teach away from using cookies. Thus, it is unclear to Applicants how and why IETF and Bennett can be combined.

Additionally, the Office Action has not clearly identified how IETF RFC 2109, Bennett, and Krane are combinable. That is, the Office Action fails to indicate which reference teaches the

"first computer", the "second computer", the "other computers", and other limitations in the claims. Applicants request that this identification be done to clarify the rejections in this case.

Moreover, the Office Action appears to select features of each of these references, without the requisite motivation that must be taught by at least one reference to combine these features. Without such motivation, combining the references is clearly hindsight, which is impermissible.

Therefore, based on the above remarks, Applicants requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1, 11, 14, and 15.

Claims 2-10 depend from Claim 1, Claims 12-13 depend from Claim 11, and Claims 16-19 depend from Claim 15. Based on these dependencies, Applicants also request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 2-10, 12-13, and 16-19.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-19 are pending in the present Application. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

If there are any questions, please telephone the undersigned at 408-451-5907 to expedite prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Customer No.: 24488

Jeanette S. Harms
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 35,537

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as FIRST CLASS MAIL in an envelope addressed to: Box AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on April 21, 2004.

4/21/2004
Date

Signature: Rebecca A. Baumann